NEW NAMES AND COMBINATIONS, PRINCIPALLY IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN PLORA--IV

William A. Weber University of Colorado Museum Campus Box 218, Boulder, CO 80309

The third paper in this series was published in Phytologia 53:187-190. 1983.

A NEW GENUS OF GRASSES FROM THE WESTERN OIL SHALES

ARGILLOCHLOA W. A. Weber, gen. nov. (Poaceae)

Gramen perenne, inflorescentis non secundis, ramis floriferis rigidissimo-divaricatis basalibus 2, spiculis 2-floribus, gluma secundo lemma secundum aequans, lemmatibus sterilibus nullis vel rudimento clavato sterili faciens, a Festuca differt.

Type species: Argillochloa dasyclada (Hackel ex Beal) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Festuca dasyclada Hack. ex Beal, Grasses N. Amer. 2:602. 1875. Derivation from Greek, argillos, clay (including shale), + chloe, grass.

Festuca dasyclada, until very recently, was known from the type locality (Wasatch Plateau, Emery County, Utah), but field knowledge was nil. Irvine et al. (1978), reporting it from Colorado, wrote: "This plant was listed as "possibly extinct" in the "Report on Endangered and Threatened Species of the United States"... Only two vouchers of this taxon exist in major herbaria (US, NY), and mention of the species last occurs in the second edition of Hitchcock's treatment of the grasses...."

This species was reported from Colorado (Irvine, <u>1.c.</u>) from the Upper Parachute Member of the Green River Formation and the Uinta Sandstone throughout Garfield County, Colorado. Recent activity involving environmental impact research has added a number of localities in Rio Blanco County at altitudes from 2,135-2,580 meters (7,120-9,000 ft.). <u>Argillochloa</u> often occurs abundantly on shaded slopes in mountain shrub communities (<u>e.g. Padus virginiana</u>, Juniperus osteosperma, <u>Amelanchier utahensis</u>, <u>Symphoricarpos</u> oreophilus stands), here to the exclusion of Oryzopsis.

The plant is a bunch-grass with a very strong but superficial resemblance to <u>Oryzopsis hymenoides</u>, and occurring near it on the same areas of shale scree slopes. The two grasses seem to have slightly different ecological preferences, however, because stands of <u>Argillochloa</u> are never as ubiquitous as those of <u>Oryzopsis</u>, which commonly colonizes mixed soils of eroding road banks as well as the pure shale slopes.

Argillochloa differs strikingly from Festuca by its rigidly divaricate secondary branches, at the bases of which a stronglydeveloped convex, often red, pulvinus fills the axils; the spikelets have an unusually long second glume which equals the second lemma; the spikelets have two fertile florets; the terminal rachilla is either naked or sometimes topped by an early-deciduous sterile rudiment; the lowermost branchlets of the inflorescence are paired; the inflorescence is not at all secund as in Festuca; at maturity the flowering culms commonly break away and behave like tumbleweeds. The habit is extremely unusual for Festuca, at least as it is known in America.

Signe Frederiksen (Univ. of Copenhagen, corresp.) has kindly made a thorough anatomical analysis of Argillochloa and found that, as she expected, "the anatomy is within the variation of the genus Festuca, but the guestion is how important that observation is." She continues: "According to Metcalfe (1960: Anatomy of Monocotyledons I. Anatomical evidences concerning genera and species: '.... there is a marked overlap in the characters of those genera that are generally accepted as being closely related to one another. This seems to indicate that differences between closely related genera, based on leaf characters alone, would be of little taxonomic value.' I would like to turn it around and say that if the morphological characters are strong enough to separate this taxon from Festuca, then resemblance in the anatomy of the leaf blade is of minor significance." Frederiksen was impressed by the morphological divergence of Argillochloa from Festuca noted herein.

I am greatly indebted to Dr. Dieter Wilken, Colorado State University, who has determined the chromosome number, 2n=28 (14 bivalents at metaphase). This is consistent with the basic number of <u>Festuca</u> and allies (x=7) and represents a modal number for many western North American species. Voucher specimen: <u>Wilken 13567</u> (CS), Rio Blanco Co.: Piceance Creek, 2 mi W of Rio Blanco, 22 Sept. 1979.

NEW COMBINATIONS IN LINUM, SENS. LAT.

ADENOLINUM GRANDIFLORUM (Desf.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Linum grandiflorum Desf., Flora Atlantica 1:278. t. 78. 1798.

ADENOLINUM PRATENSE (Norton) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Linum lewisii pratense J. B. S. Norton, Trans. Acad. Sci. St. Louis 12:38, pl.6. 1902. Rogers (1968), in a review of the yellow-flowered species of Linum in western North America, did not concern himself with the generic problem in the genus Linum, <u>sens. lat.</u> Linum is based on the type, Linum usitatissimum L., a blue-flowered annual species with linear stigmas and erect flowers and basic chromosome number, x=15. In western North America, the blue-flowered group, <u>Adenolinum</u> Reichenbach (1837), has capitate stigmas and recurved fruiting pedicels, and basic chromosome number x=9. The pale yellow-flowered group consists of two welldefined line, both with x=8, though otherwise cytologically distinct according to Löve (corresp.): one, <u>Cathartolinum</u> Rchb. (1837), based on Linum catharticum L., with white petals with yellow claws. The other is Rogers' L. schiedeanum complex, which Small (1907) included in his broadly construed <u>Cathartolinum</u>, differing significantly in fruit dehiscence, ovule number, pollen morphology, style morphology, and basic chromosome number x=8, from <u>Mesynium</u> Raf. (1838) (Rogers' L. rigidum group) with a basic chromosome number of x=15. Rogers clearly tabulated these important differences but declined to divide the genera. Löve & Löve recently revived <u>Adenolinum</u> and <u>Mesynium</u> (Löve 1982), quite justifiably in my opinion. With <u>Adenolinum</u>, <u>Cathartolinum</u> s. <u>str</u>., and <u>Mesynium</u> segregated, the L. <u>schiedeanum</u> complex forms a distinct group, but it needs more study before assigning it generic status.

MESYNIUM Raf., Fl. Telluriana 3:33. Nov.-Dec. 1837. A lectotype should be designated. Of the five species mentioned, M. texanum was new, three others were nom. nuda, and M. mexicanum (H.B.K.) Raf., was a transfer. I propose M. mexicanum be chosen as the lectotype.

MESYNIUM ALATUM (Small) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. <u>Catharto-</u> linum alatum Small, N. Am. Fl. 25:81. 1907.

MESYNIUM ARISTATUM (Engelm. in Wisliz.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Linum aristatum Engelm. in Wisliz., Tour Northern Mexico 101. 1848.

MESYNIUM AUSTRALE (Heller) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Linum australe Heller, Bull. Torr. Bot. Club 25:627. 1898.

MESYNIUM AUSTRALE ssp. GLANDULOSUM (C. M. Rogers) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Linum australe var. glandulosum Rogers, Sida 1:336. 1964.

MESYNIUM IMBRICATUM (Raf.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Nezera imbricata Raf., New Flora & Bot. North Amer. 4:66. 1838.

MESYNIUM HUDSONIOIDES (Planch.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Linum hudsonioides Planch., Lond. J. Bot. 7:186. 1848.

MESYNIUM PUBERULUM (Engelm. in A. Gray) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Linum rigidum var. puberulum Engelm. in A. Gray, Smithson. Contr. Knowl. 3 (Pl. Wright. 1): 25. 1852.

MESYNIUM SUBTERES (Trel. in A. Gray) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Linum aristatum Engelm. var. subteres Trel. in A. Gray, Syn. Fl. N. Am. 1(1):347. 1897.

MESYNIUM VERNALE (Wooton) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Linum vernale Wooton, Bull. Torr. Bot. Club 25:452. 1898.

ALETES (APIACEAE): AN EXPANDED CONCEPT

Despite the fact that many eminent American botanists have attempted to classify the western North American Apiaceae, several genera remain to some extent artificial. While one complete treatment (Mathias and Constance, 1944-45) has tended to stabilize and reduce a number of generic names, the submergence of some of the old genera has simply served to hide the fact that large ones like Lomatium and Cymopterus are still very heterogeneous, and unless monographers of some of the allied genera carefully reexamine these large ones for misfits, this situation will likely continue.

3

The history of classification of the western North American umbels also displays a lack of consideration of the whole organism, its total morphology and habitus, its chemistry, phytogeography and its ecology--the whole constellation of characters. Too much emphasis, I feel, has been placed on too few.

The genus <u>Aletes</u> is based on <u>Aletes acaulis</u> C. & R., 1888 (<u>Deweya acaulis</u> Torr.). A revision of this genus was published very recently (Theobald, Tseng and Mathias, 1963). It was undertaken as a result of my rediscovery of <u>Neoparrya lithophila</u> and my suggestion, which they accepted, that <u>Pteryxia anisata</u> should be referred to <u>Aletes</u>. I have never been satisfied with the maintenance of <u>Neoparrya</u> as a monotypic genus, and recently (Weber 1979) I transferred a second taxon, <u>N. megarrhiza</u>, out of <u>Lomatium</u>, where it was anomalous.

Theobald <u>et al</u>., while they described a few new taxa, did not examine other genera for possible transfers to <u>Aletes</u>. They also deferred study of <u>Pteryxia</u> and implied that they were about to study <u>Cymopterus</u>. They pointed out, however, Cronquist's (1961) expansion of <u>Cymopterus</u> to include two more somewhat discordant elements, Pteryxia and Pseudocymopterus.

Theobald <u>et al</u>. described <u>Aletes</u> as "perennials from slender to thickened alongated roots". This is inaccurate. The structures they refer to are caudices that are covered with marcescent sheathing petiole bases, a critical difference. I would expand their generic concept to include plants with yellow, pale yellow to whitish and exceptionally (as in <u>Pseudocymopterus</u>) purple, flowers. And I would allow for considerable variation in the number, size and disposition of the vittae, and in the compression and development of the lateral and dorsal wings of the mericarps. I agree completely when they say that "the genus is remarkably consistent in its habit and basic leaf pattern". Their monograph is a good starting point, but more bricks need to be laid in order to make the building complete.

Without seriously altering the circumscription provided by Theobald <u>et al</u>., I regard <u>Aletes</u> as a natural group embodying the following unique constellation of characters:

- 1. Plants densely caespitose with stout, branched caudices clothed with long-enduring marcescent petiole-bases.
- Strictly acaulescent (this eliminates <u>Pteryxia terebinthina</u> and <u>C. beckii</u> Welsh & Goodrich, which are always slightly caulescent); these may yet prove to belong to <u>Aletes</u>.
- 3. Pseudoscapes never developed.
- 4. Plants strongly scented (anise, citronella, celery).
- 5. Leaves pinnatifid or pinnate, with pinnae simple or pinnatifid, usually stiff-textured.
- Bracteoles always well-developed, lance-linear to linear, dimidiate.
- 7. Involucre never developed.

- Flowers yellow, pale yellow, whitish, or exceptionally purple.
- 9. Rays subequal, widely spreading, sometimes the outer ones deflexed at maturity.
- Mericarps with variable development of lateral wings; dorsal ridges often prominent.
- 12. Mericarps usually trapezoidal in cross-section, not or variably dorsally compressed.
- 13. Stylopodium none, the styles arising out of the base of a spongy disk (some authors seem to have confused this disk with a low stylopodium).

If, bearing in mind this set of characters, one returns to the standard treatment of North American umbels, several taxa stand out in Lomatium, Pteryxia and Cymopterus as discordant elements. Furthermore, these taxa have always been controversial, placed variously in other discarded genera such as <u>Cynomarathrum</u>, Pseudoreoxis and Pseudopteryxia.

The following new combinations are proposed to bring these taxa into Aletes.

ALETES BIPINNATA (S. Wats.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. <u>Pseudo-</u> cymopterus bipinnatus C. & R., Rev. N. Am. Umbell. 75. 1888.

ALETES EASTWOODIAE (C. & R.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Cynomarathrum eastwoodiae C. & R., Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. 7:247. 1900.

ALETES HENDERSONII (C. & R.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Pseudocymopterus hendersonii C. & R., Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. 7:190. 1900.

ALETES JUNCEA (Barneby & Holmgren) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Lomatium junceum Barneby & Holmgren, Brittonia 31:96. 1979. Barneby & Holmgren (1979), in recognizing and presenting a key to the "Cynomarathrum species of Lomatium" saw the natural group that I feel is incorrectly placed in Lomatium, but they made no connection with <u>Aletes</u>. They, however, included L. triternatum and L. concinnum, two caulescent species, in the group.

ALETES LATILOBA (Rydb.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Cynomarathrum latilobum Rydb., Bull. Torr. Bot. Club 40:73. 1913.

ALETES LITHOPHILA (Mathias) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Neoparrya lithophila Mathias, Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. 16:393. 1929.

ALETES LONGILOBA (Rydb.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. <u>Pseudopteryxia longiloba</u> Rydb., Bull. Torr. Bot. Club 40:72. 1913. Mathias, Theobald & Tseng (1964) did not include this taxon in their monograph of <u>Aletes</u> (despite the fact that Rydberg clearly showed its close relationship to <u>P. anisata</u>), probably because Mathias had earlier synonymized it (incorrectly, I feel) under <u>Pteryxia hendersonii</u>. Mathias <u>et al</u>. (1964) declined to discuss more delicate leaf texture and more <u>Slender</u> and attenuate leaf segments, but displays the same strong anise scent.

ALETES MEGARRHIZA (A. Nels.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. <u>Peuce-</u> danum megarrhizum A. Nels., Bull. Torr. Bot. Club 26:130. 1899.

ALETES MINIMA (Mathias) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Lomatium minimum Mathias, Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. 25:273. 1937.

ALETES NIVALIS (S. Wats.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Cymopterus nivalis S. Wats., Bot. King's Exp. 123. 1871.

ALETES NUTTALLII (A. Gray) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Seseli nuttallii A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. 8:287, in part. 1870.

ALETES PARRYI (S. Wats.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Peucedanum parryi S. Wats., Proc. Amer. Acad. 11:143. 1876.

ALETES PETRAEA (M. E. Jones) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Cymopterus petraeus M. E. Jones, Contr. W. Bot. 8:32. 1898.

ALETES SCABRA (C. & R.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Cynomarathrum scabrum C. & R., Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. 7:247. 1900.

ASKELLIA, A NEW SEGREGATE OF THE GENUS CREPIS

ASKELLIA W. A. Weber, genus nov. (Asteraceae).

Based on Crepis, Sect. Ixeridopsis Babcock, Univ. Calif. Publ. Bot. 22:212. 1947. Typus: Crepis nana Richardson. This genus, differing morphologically and cytologically from Crepis and Psilochenia (Crepis, sens. lat., cf. Babcock 1938, see Weber 1983), represents an Old World group with a basic chromosome number of x=7. It is named in honor of my friend Askell Love, student of Arne Muntzing and Eric Hulten, dean of the Icelandic flora, founder and first president of the International Organization of Plant Biosystematists. His dedication to the Science of Botany, his encyclopedic memory of botanical information, his understanding of biosystematic, especially cytological, techniques and his exposition of its philosophy, his role in developing the concept of the Flora Europaea and, in its earliest phase, what became the Flora North America Project, has earned him lasting recognition as one of the outstanding plant taxonomists of our generation. His kindness and support of colleagues and young botanists is well-known and appreciated by all who have benefitted from knowing him.

ASKELLIA ALAICA (Krasch.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Crepis alaica Krasch., Tr. Bot. Inst. AN SSSR, ser. 1,1:182. 1933.

ASKELLIA CORNICULATA (Regel & Schmalh.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. <u>Crepis corniculata</u> Regel & Schmalh., Izv. Obsc. Ljubit. Estestv. Antrop. Etnogr. 34(2):54. 182.

ASKELLIA ELEGANS (Hook.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Crepis elegans Hook., Fl. Bor.-Amer. 1:297. 1834.

ASKELLIA FLEXUOSA (Ledeb.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Prenanthes polymorpha gamma flexuosa Ledeb., Fl. Altaica 4:145. 1833.

ASKELLIA KARELINII (M. Pop. & Schischk. in Popov) W. A. Weber, comb.nov. Crepis karelinii M. Pop. & Schischk. in Popov, Fl. Almat. zapovedn., Addenda 28:757. 1940. ASKELLIA LACTEA (Lipsch.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Crepis lactea Lipsch., Fedde's Repert. 42:159. 1937.

ASKELLIA NANA (Richards.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. <u>Crepis</u> nana Richards., Bot. App. Franklin, 1st Jour. ed. 1:746. (p.18 in repr.) 1823; ed. 2:757 (p.29 in repr.). 1823.

ASKELLIA NANA ssp. RAMOSA (Babcock) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Crepis nana ssp. ramosa Babcock, Univ. Calif. Publ. Bot. 22:542. fig. 155. 1947.

ASKELLIA SOGDIANA (Krasch.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Youngia sogdiana Krasch., Bot. Mat. Herb. Bot. Inst. AN SSSR 9(4-12):184. 1946.

THE WESTERN NORTH AMERICAN WOODY SAGEBRUSHES

The western North American woody sagebrushes centering about Artemisia tridentata belong to a homogeneous group of similar morphology and ecology, differing from all other local <u>Artemisia</u> in having homogamous heads. One additional species was described from southern South America. Related species in Eurasia were segregated from <u>Artemisia</u> by Polyakov (1961) based on the type species <u>Seriphidium maritimum</u> (L.) Pol. <u>Artemisia</u>, Section <u>Seriphidium</u> had been proposed for this group by Besser (1829) and accepted by Hooker (1833) for <u>Artemisia cana</u> Pursh. Rouy (1903) treated it as <u>Artemisia</u>, Subgenus <u>Seriphidium</u>. The American species were treated by DeCandolle (1837) as <u>Artemisia</u>, Sect. <u>Seriphidium</u>, subsect. <u>Trifida</u>. This group has been treated exhaustively by Ward (1953). Earlier accounts include those of Rydberg (1916) and Hall & Clements (1923).

The North American members of the genus <u>Seriphidium</u> form a very natural unit and I propose recognizing them as a subgenus under the genus <u>Seriphidium</u> Polyakov.

SERIPHIDIUM, Subgenus TRIDENTATA (McArthur) W. A. Weber, subgenus nov. Based on <u>Artemisia</u>, Subgenus <u>Tridentata</u> ["<u>Tridentatae</u>"] McArthur (1981); <u>Artemisia</u>, subsect. <u>Trifida</u> DC., Prodr. 6:105. 1837. Typus: <u>Seriphidium canum</u> (Pursh) W. A. Weber. In this subgenus I include Rydberg's Subgenus <u>Seriphidium</u> of <u>Artemisia</u>, encompassing his Sections <u>Tridentatae</u>, <u>Rigidae</u> and <u>Pygmaeae</u>. McArthur (1981) included only Section <u>Tridentatae</u> Rydb.

SERIPHIDIUM ARBUSCULUM (Nutt.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Artemisia arbuscula Nutt., Trans. Amer. Phil. Soc. II. 7:398. 1841.

SERIPHIDIUM ARBUSCULUM ssp. LONGILOBUM (Osterh.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. <u>Artemisia spiciformis</u> var. <u>longiloba</u> Osterh., Muhlenbergia 4:69. 1908.

SERIPHIDIUM CANUM (Pursh) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Artemisia cana Pursh, Fl. Amer. Sept. 521. 1814.

SERIPHIDIUM CANUM ssp. BOLANDERI (A. Gray) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Artemisia bolanderi A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. 19:50. 1883.

SERIPHIDIUM CANUM ssp. VISCIDULUM (Osterh.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Artemisia cana var. viscidula Osterh., Bull. Torr. Bot. Club 26:507. 1900.

SERIPHIDIUM PYGMAEUM (A. Gray) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Artemisia pygmaea A. Gray. Proc. Amer. Acad. 21:413. 1886.

SERIPHIDIUM NOVUM (A. Nels.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Artemisia nova A. Nels., Bull. Torr. Bot. Club 27:274. 1900.

SERIPHIDIUM RIGIDUM (Nutt.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Artemisia trifida beta rigida Nutt., Trans. Amer. Phil. Soc. II. 7:398. 1841.

SERIPHIDIUM ROTHROCKII (A. Gray) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Artemisia tridentata ssp. rothrockii Hall & Clements, Carnegie Inst. Wash. Publ. 326:139. 1923.

SERIPHIDIUM TRIDENTATUM (Nutt.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Artemisia tridentata Nutt., Trans. Amer. Phil. Soc. II. 7:398. 1841.

SERIPHIDIUM TRIDENTATUM ssp. PARISHII (A. Gray) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. <u>Artemisia parishii</u> A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. 17:220. 1882.

SERIPHIDIUM TRIDENTATUM ssp. VASEYANUM (Rydb.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. <u>Artemisia vaseyana</u> Rydb., N. Amer. Flora 34:283. 1916. SERIPHIDIUM TRIDENTATUM ssp. WYOMINGENSE (Beetle & Young) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. <u>Artemisia tridentata</u> ssp. <u>wyomingensis</u> Beetle & Young, Rhodora 67:405. 1965.

SERIPHIDIUM TRIPARTITUM (Rydb.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Artemisia tripartita Rydb., Mem. N. Y. Bot. Gard. 1:432. 1900. trifida Nutt., 1841, non Turcz. 1832.

Artemisia bigelovii A. Gray bears a strong superficial resemblance to <u>Seriphidium</u>, Subg. <u>Tridentata</u>, but Hall & Clements, and Ward, considered it to belong to <u>Artemisia</u>, Sect. <u>Abrotanum</u>. Shultz (1983, <u>ined</u>.) brings further evidence to bear toward this conclusion.

Artemisia mendozana DC., Prodromus 6:105. 1837, was included in the Subsect. <u>Trifida</u> by DeCandolle and presumably belongs in <u>Seriphidium</u>, but not having seen any material I hesitate to transfer it at this time.

Artemisia palmeri A. Gray, included by Ward, and Hall & Clements under Sect. <u>Seriphidium</u> remains anomalous, differing by its chaffy receptacle, elongate herbaceous branches, bicolored, deeply incised leaf-blades suggestive of <u>A. vulgaris</u>, and nearly equal phyllaries. I lean toward retaining <u>Artemisiastrum</u> Rydberg for this monotype.

MISCELLANY

ACROLASIA THOMPSONII (Glad) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Mentzelia thompsonii Glad, Madrono 23:289. 1976.

BROMELICA BULBOSA (Geyer ex Porter & Coulter) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Melica bulbosa Geyer ex Porter & Coulter, Syn. Fl.

Colo. p. 149. 1874. The articulation of the spikelets above the glumes, the lack of tendency of the spikelets to nod, and the world distribution patterns of <u>Melica</u> typified by <u>M. nutans</u> L. according to Tzvelev (1976) and <u>Bromelica</u> (Boyle, 1945), suggest that these groups represent different phyletic lines.

BROMELICA SPECTABILIS (Scribn.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Melica spectabilis Scribn., Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila. 37:45. 1885.

DELPHINIUM RAMOSUM Rydb. var. ALPESTRE (Rydb.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. <u>Delphinium alpestre</u> Rydb., Bull. Torr. Bot. Club 29:146. 1902.

IPOMOPSIS STENOTHYRSA (A. Gray) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Gilia stenothyrsa A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. 8:276. 1870.

NUTTALLIA ARGILLOSA (Darlington) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Mentzelia argillosa Darlington, Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. 21:153. 1934.

NUTTALLIA REVERCHONII (Urb. & Gilg) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Mentzelia pumila (Nutt.) T. & G. var. reverchonii Urb. & Gilg, Nov. Act. Nat. Cur. [Abh. K. Leop.-Carol. Deutsch. Akad. Naturf.] 76:94. 1900. <u>Mentzelia reverchonii</u> Thompson & Zavortink, Wrightia 4:24. 1968.

OLIGOSPORUS CAMPESTRIS (L.) Cass. ssp. CAUDATUS (Michx.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Artemisia caudata Michx., Fl. Bor. Amer. 2:129. 1803. The genus <u>Oligosporus</u> was proposed by <u>Cassini</u> for those groups of <u>Artemisia</u> with staminate disk flowers (Section Dracunculus of Hall & Clements, 1923).

OLIGOSPORUS CAMPESTRIS (L.) Cass. ssp. PACIFICUS (Nutt.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. <u>Artemisia pacifica</u> Nutt., Trans. Amer. Phil. Soc. II. 7:401. 1841.

OLIGOSPORUS FILIFOLIUS (Torr.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Artemisia filifolia Torr., Ann. Lyc. N. Y. 2:211. 1828.

OLIGOSPORUS PEDATIFIDUS (Nutt.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Artemisia pedatifida Nutt., Trans. Amer. Phil. Soc. 11. 7:399. 1841.

PACKERA OODES (Rydb.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. Senecio oodes Rydb., Bull. Torr. Bot. Club 33:158. 1906.

VITICELLA ORIENTALIS (L.) W. A. Weber, comb. nov. <u>Clematis</u> orientalis L., Sp. Pl. 543. 1753.

CORRECTIONS

In a previous paper (Weber & Love 1981), inadvertent errors were made concerning the following new combinations and their basionyms. I am indebted to Dr. T. M. Barkley for drawing them to my attention.

Packera cana f. eradiata (D. C. Eaton) Weber & Löve, comb. nov. <u>Senecio canus</u> var. <u>eradiatus</u> D. C. Eaton in S. Wats., Bot. King's Expl. 190. 1871.

Packera cymbalarioides (Buek) Weber & Löve, comb. nov. Senecio cymbalarioides Buek, Index DC. Prodr. 2:6. 1840.

Packera rosei Weber & Love, based on <u>Senecio rosei</u> Greenman sine diagn. is a nomen nudum.

LITERATURE CITED

Airy-Shaw, H. K. 1966. J. C. Willis, A Dictionary of the Flowering Plants and Ferns, 7th Ed. Cambridge.

Babcock, E. V., & G. L. Stebbins, Jr. 1938. The American species of <u>Crepis</u>: their interrelationships and distribution as affected by polyploidy and apomixis. Carnegie Inst. Wash. Publ. No. 504:1-119. 34 fig. 12 tab.

Babcock, E. B. 1947. The genus <u>Crepis</u>. Parts I, II. Univ. Calif. Publ. Bot. 21-22:1-1030.

Barneby, Rupert C., & Noel H. Holmgren. 1979. A new species of Lomatium (Apiaceae) from Utah. Brittonia 31:96-100.

Besser, W.S.J.G. 1829. De <u>Seriphidiis</u> seu de Sectione II-a Artemisiarum. Bull. Soc. Bot. Moscou 2 (p. 222).

. 1834. Tentamen de <u>Abrotanis</u> seu de Secttione II-a Artemisiarum. Mem. Soc. Nat. Moscou 3 (p. 5).

Boyle, W. S. 1945. A cyto-taxonomic study of the North American species of <u>Melica</u>. Madrono 8:1-26.

Candolle, A. P. de. 1837. CDXCIX. Artemisia Linn. Prodromus 6:93-127.

Hall, Harvey M., & Frederic E. Clements. 1923. The phylogenetic method in taxonomy: the North American species of <u>Arte-</u> <u>misia</u>, <u>Chrysothamnus</u>, and <u>Atriplex</u>. Carnegie Inst. Wash. Publ. 326:i-iii, 1-355. 58 plates.

Hooker, W. J. 1833. Flora Boreali-Americana 1:325.

Irvine, James R., Neil E. West, & A. H. Holmgren. 1978. Rediscovery of <u>Festuca dasyclada</u> and range extensions of <u>Astraga-</u> <u>lus lutosus</u> and <u>Ceanothus martinii</u> in Colorado. Southwestern Nat. 23:156-157.

King, Robert M., & Helen W. Dawson (eds.). 1975. Cassini on Compositae. 3 vols. (reprint). Oriole Editions. New York.

Love, Askell. 1982. IOPB chromosome number reports LXXV: reports by Askell Love and Doris Love. Taxon 31:344-360.

Mathias, M. E., & Lincoln Constance. 1944-45. Umbelliferae. North American Flora 28B:43-295.

McArthur, E. D., C. L. Pope, & D. C. Freeman. 1981. Chromosomal studies of subgenus <u>Tridentatae</u> of <u>Artemisia</u>: evidence for autopolyploidy. Amer. J. Bot. 68:589-605.

Polyakov, P. P. 1961. Materialy k sistematike roda polyin--Artemisia L. Trudy Inst. Bot. AN Kazakhskoy SSR 11:134-177.

Rogers, C. M. 1968. Yellow-flowered species of Linum in Central America and western North America. Brittonia 20:107-135.

Shultz, Leila M. 1983. Systematics and anatomical studies of <u>Artemisia</u> Subgenus <u>Tridentatae</u>. Ph.D. Thesis, Claremont.

Small, John Kunkel. 1907. Linaceae, in North American Flora 25(1):67-87.